UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/706,745	11/12/2003	Vivek Y. Reddy	035249/US-475387-73	7530
30873 DORSEY & W	7590 10/15/2007 HITNEY I I P	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 250 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10177			MEHTA, BHISMA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3767	
				•
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		10/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Interview Summary	10/706,745	REDDY ET AL.			
interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Bhisma Mehta	3767			
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):				
(1) <u>Kevin Sirmons</u> .	(3)				
(2) <u>Geoffrey David</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: <u>11 October 2007</u> .					
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2)□ applicant's representative]					
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description:					
Claim(s) discussed: <u>27</u> .					
Identification of prior art discussed:					
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g	g)⊠ was not reached. h)⊡ N	I/A.			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:					

	Application No.	Applicant(s) '		
Interview Summary	10/706,745	REDDY ET AL.		
interview dummary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Bhisma Mehta	3767		
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):			
(1) <u>Bhisma Mehta</u> .	(3) <u>Geoffrey David</u> .			
(2) <u>Gary Abelev</u> .	(4)			
Date of Interview: <u>04 October 2007</u> .				
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant	2) <u> </u>	·]		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) No.			
Claim(s) discussed: 27,28 and 35.				
Identification of prior art discussed: <u>none</u> .				
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached.	ı)⊠ was not reached. h)⊡ N	I/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .	nature of what was agreed to	if an agreement was		
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)				
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.				
	KEVIN C. SIRMONS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXA	MINER		
•	Revin C. Arm	nsm		
Evaminer Note: You must sign this form unless it is an	Chana	Mehl		
= variable Note: Volumitet eign thie torm linidee it ie an		-		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-413 (Rev. 04-03)

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: It was indicated to Mr. Abelev and Mr. David that the advisory action mailed on September 25 2007 is proper and the proposed amendments would not be entered as the proposed amendments change the scope of the claims, thus requiring further search and consideration. The scope of all of the claims has been changed due to the proposed amendment. On October 9, 2007, it was indicated to Mr. David that this application has been reviewed with Examiner's supervisor, Kevin Sirmons, and that if further clarification of the validity of the advisory action was needed, Mr. Abelev and Mr. David should contact Mr. Sirmons.